

REMARKS

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Office Action dated October 7, 2004. In that Office Action, claims 1-32 were examined, and all claims were rejected. More specifically, claims 1-4, 10-12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (USPN 5,471,399) and Devine et al. (USPN 6,631,402); claims 5-9 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka/Devine and Amplich et al. (USPN 6,344,859); and claims 13-16 and 22-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka/Devine and Lindhorst (USPN 6,337,696). Reconsideration of these rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested.

In this Response, claims 4 have been amended; claims 1-17 have been canceled; new claims 33-38 have been added; and no claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 18-38 remain present for examination.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1-17 are canceled herein. The Applicants reserve the right to prosecute these claims at a later time.

Claim 27 is rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claims. Claims 18 and 22 are amended to depend from now independent claim 27.

New claims 33-38 are added herein. Support for these claims can be found in FIG. 8 and the discussion referencing FIG. 8 from page 38, line 16 to page 41, line 4 among other places in the specification.

Tanaka et al. (USPN 5,471,399)

Before addressing the Examiner's specific rejections, Applicants wish to discuss the Tanaka reference in detail, as Tanaka is relied on in all the rejections.

Tanaka is directed to graphically displaying the status of a network of hardware resources. See, Tanaka col. 1, lines 7-11, ("The present invention relates to a network management system, and in particular, to a network management system having a display for and a network status display method-of displaying a network configuration and a network operation

status.”). Tanaka does not provide any control over the network, only a display of the status of the network. Tanaka does not teach retrieving anything other than current status information from its “managed object instance” hardware devices.

The preamble of the pending claims contain structure

In anticipation that the Examiner may point out that in claims 1, 15 and 28 some of the elements listed above not shown by Tanaka are in the preamble of some of the independent claims, Applicants remind the Examiner that the elements “resource having at least one object, each object having associated attribute and task information,” provide the necessary structure so that it is known where the attribute and task information is obtained in the retrieving step. This clearly limits the structure of the claimed invention and, therefore, must be treated as a claim limitation as required under the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Section 2111.02.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 10-12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (USPN 5,471,399) and Devine et al. (USPN 6,631,402). These claims are canceled herein and therefore the rejection is moot.

Claims 5-9 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka/Devine and Amplich et al. (USPN 6,344,859). Claims 5-9 are canceled herein and therefore the rejection of them is moot. Claims 18-21 are amended hererin to depend from claim 27, which is believed to be allowable over the cited references.

Claims 13-16 and 22-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka/Devine and Lindhorst et al. (USPN 6,337,696). Claims 13-16 are canceled herein and therefore the rejection of these claims is moot. Claims 22-26 and 28-32 now depend from claim 27 which is believed to be allowable over the cited references as described below.

Rejection of Claim 27 over Tanaka, Devine and Lindhorst

The Examiner rejected claim 27 (as well as 28 and 32) indicating only that the “Devine teaches a property sheet (figs.9a-9h).” The Applicants respectfully disagree. and believe that the Examiner may be confused by the “property sheet” term, which is a term of art and does not simply mean any display of properties. Nothing in Devine’s discussion indicates that property sheets of objects as described by the Applicants are being displayed as part of the search and

generate report process. In fact, not only does the phrase “property sheet” not appear in Devine, there is no discussion at all of any data structure that would correspond or be similar to a property sheet as defined by the Applicants.

Applicants describe and define the term “property sheets” and “property pages” throughout the specification. See, e.g. page 30 line 1 to page 31, line 6 and page 32, lines 2-10. In embodiments of the present invention, the Applicants system allows users to manage objects via their property sheets, rather than through monolithic management applications. The property sheets and pages are accessed by the browser and functionality is directly available without the need to access an application for the functionality.

Devine, on the other hand, is a prior art system which uses monolithic applications to manage the data and the resources of the network. Take, for example, Devine’s Report Manager server 250 which Devine describes as:

“[The Report Manager Server 250] is an, application responsible for the synchronization of report inventory with the back-end ‘Fulfilling’ servers 400, 500; retrieval of entitlements, i.e., a user’s security profiles, and report pick list information, i.e., data for user report customization options, from the system Order Entry server 280; the transmission of report responses or messages to the Dispatcher server 26 (FIG. 6); the maintenance of the reporting databases; and, the management of metadata used for displaying reports. In the preferred embodiment, the RM server 250 employs a Unix daemon that passively listens for connect requests from the GUI client applications and other back-end servers and deploys the TCP/IP protocol to receive and route requests and their responses.” Col. 11, line 60 to col. 12, line 6.

Devine’s FIGS. 9a-9h are described by Devine as “FIGS. 9(a)-9(h) illustrate various examples of report requestor screen dialogs enabling user customization of report requests.” Devine, col. 2, lines 63-65. In Devine, the graphical user interfaces (GUIs) displayed in these figures allow a user to interface with the report manager application to perform searches and generate reports as is common in database management. While Devine does use a browser as described in the present invention, it is only to provide an interface for the applications that are providing the underlying functionality, so that the applications do not have to provide their own interfaces.

In sum, Devine’s does not disclose using property sheets and/or property pages as claimed in Claims 27, 28 and 32. Nor do any of the other cited references describe, teach or

suggest, a GUI that manages objects via property sheets or pages. Therefore, Applicants believe that amended Claim 27 and its dependent claims 18-26 and 28-32 are allowable.

New Claims

New claims 33-37 are added herein. Support for these claims can be found in FIG. 8 and the discussion referencing FIG. 8 from page 38, line 16 to page 41, line 4 among other places in the specification. The new claims are believed patentable over the references cited by the Examiner as they describe generating a user interface that presents functions supported by different resources on the network in a single user interface.

Conclusion

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Dated: _____

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Respectfully submitted,

George C. Lewis, Reg. No. 53,214
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1639